

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

FILED ENTERED
LODGED RECEIVED

NOV 27 2002

AT BALTIMORE
CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

DEPUTY

FLEXCEL, INC.,
Plaintiff

v.

LUI CORPORATION, et al.,
Defendants

CIVIL NO. AMD 02-3825

...o0o...

ORDER

The Plaintiff's "Request for Writs of Attachment Before Judgment" has been read and considered. Plaintiff seems to suggest that in any case alleging fraud, such extraordinary relief should be ordered as a matter of course. This a highly dubious proposition. *See Belcher v. Government Employees Ins. Co.*, 282 Md. 718, 720, 387 A.2d 770, 772 (1978) ("Attachment proceedings, which find their roots in this State's right to subject all property within its borders to its laws . . . , serve the purpose, among others, of insuring the just payment of debts *by affording creditors the opportunity to seize the property of a debtor who cannot be reached by service of process because of nonresidence or flight.*")(emphasis added); *cf. Connecticut v. Doeher*, 501 U.S. 1 (1991)(prejudgment attachment of real property). I am satisfied that prejudgment attachment is not warranted in this case.

Accordingly, it is this 27th day of November, 2002, ORDERED that the Plaintiff's "Request for Writs of Attachment Before Judgment" is DENIED.



ANDRE M. DAVIS
United States District Judge



